

Make love not war?: Transformative terms at a time of radical environmental action maturity and biospheric endangerment

ABSTRACT

This study employs a praxis orientation to illuminate and inform the reconfigurative force of organized radical environmental action. We focus on the case study of Sea Shepherd, a global ocean protection organization with a 40-year history of nuanced and at times contradictory framing of activism with the public. Sea Shepherd was founded in the same decade as many other formatively radical organizations in response to escalating human environmental degradation and corporate cooption of mainstream environmentalism. The activist and representative tactics of these organizations are of specific interest as they begin a maturity phase that coincides with the planet entering an unprecedented anthropogenic moment of reckoning. We argue no-compromise direct action may be framed either as contrary to status quo exploitative practices – *against* framing – or as a collaborative means with other change makers to mutually beneficial ecological and societal ends – *with* framing. In examining Sea Shepherd’s multiple and at times conflicting positioning of cetaceans, its emphasis on celebrity and timely campaigns, and its longstanding military, war, and piracy framing, we put forth arguments for representational shifts. We argue that *with* and *ecological-individual* framing, in addition to more accurately representing organizational missions and actions, could speak transformatively to broader justice-concerned populations drawn to direct environmental action guardianship, interconnectedness, and nurturance framings that subvert dominant ecocultural paradigms.

Keywords: radical environmental activism, direct action, self-representation, against vs. with framing, ecological-individual dialectic, Sea Shepherd, whales, cetaceans, protest

Highlights:

- We focus on the reconfigurative force of formatively radical environmental organizations during this unprecedented anthropogenic moment of reckoning.
- Using a case study, we illustrate organizational representations and *with* versus *against* orientations at the core of these configurations.
- We argue more inclusive representational shifts, including *ecological-individual* and *with* framing, could transformatively speak to broader justice-concerned populations.
- We illustrate ways Sea Shepherd’s identity may be in flux – as may be identities of other formatively radical environmental groups.

Word Count: 8,780

Make love not war?: Transformative terms at a time of radical environmental action maturity and biospheric endangerment

The inaugural issue of *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* posed several questions of interest to this journal, including: “Which alternative movements and approaches might provide ways to reconfigure nature/space/society relations in ways that have the scope to be truly transformative, or that allow us to reimagine and reconfigure nature-society-spaces ‘otherwise?’” (Collard et al., 2018: 15). This study takes a praxis orientation to illuminate and inform the reconfigurative force of organized radical environmental action and examine the transformative scope of environment and wildlife protection movement discourse and representations.

We focus on Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, a global ocean protection organization with a 40-year history of nuanced and at times contradictory identity formation in framing and communicating its activism with the public. Sea Shepherd was founded in 1977 (originally operating as Earthforce), in the same decade many other formatively radical environmental organizations arose in response to escalating human environmental degradation and the concurrent corporate cooption of mainstream environmentalism. Many of these groups endure, including Sea Shepherd, Greenpeace (founded in 1971), Animal Liberation Front (founded in 1976), and Earth First! (founded in 1980).¹ Their activist and representative tactics are of specific interest as

¹ Greenpeace’s radicalism engages civil disobedience but not action that damages property or lives. Earth First! still exists today but largely has been supplanted by the spin-off Earth Liberation Front.

they begin a maturity phase that coincides with the planet entering an unprecedented anthropogenic moment of reckoning – a moment when more engaging and transformative activism is paramount to reconfiguring ecological, societal, and spatial orientations.

Within the realm of formatively radical organized environmental action, we explore the direct action stance, whereby passion is a powerful catalyst for no-compromise activism. We argue that direct action, or non-violent and violent public action against established power structures with the aim of changing circumstances, may be framed either as contrary to status quo exploitative practices – *against* framing – or as a collaborative means with other change makers to mutually beneficial ecological and societal ends – *with* framing. Using these frames as a lens, we illustrate ways Sea Shepherd’s organizational identity may be in flux – as may be identities of other formatively radical environmental groups entering organizational middle age at a time of planetary urgency.

Within contexts of cultural and environmental change that has occurred during these organizations’ existence, we revisit an interview with Sea Shepherd’s founder-director Paul Watson (Lester, 2011) to discern one formatively radical environmental organization’s representational purposes and conditions. Against this backdrop, we analyse the organization’s current online representations to establish whether representational strategies and on-the-water practices sit together comfortably and what ecocultural conditions allow for or challenge these representations. In particular, we examine Sea Shepherd’s representation of its direct action stance, its multiple and at times conflicting positioning of cetaceans, its emphasis on celebrity and timely

campaigns over ongoing effective partnerships, and its longstanding military, war, and piracy framing. In doing so, we also put forth arguments for more inclusive representational shifts – and note recent shifts in Sea Shepherd’s own framing – from celebrity and client frames to wildlife as ecological and individual forces in their own right and from *against* framing taken on by many radical environmental activist organizations to working *with* wildlife, ecosystems, peoples, governments, etc.

In addition to more accurately representing organizational missions and actions, we argue *with* representations, as well as an *ecological-individual* lens (Milstein, 2011) that emphasizes wildlife as interdependent parts of ecosystems as well as individuals with agency and rights, can transformatively speak to broader internet-savvy and justice-concerned populations accessing information directly from environmental activist organizations rather than conventional news outlets (Costanza-Chock, 2012). These audiences – comprising millions of potential activists and supporters – may be more interested in the reconfigurative efficacy of no-compromise direct action guardianship, interconnectedness, and nurturance than in violent clashes and drama of long-standing interest to typical news media.

Several sources of support give weight to our expectation that “with” framing could increase support for direct action environmental activism. First, a cross-national investigation by (Sønderskov, 2008: 91) found a strongly positive association between environmental group support and generalised trust, or “the belief that people in general are trustworthy and that most people share the same basic norms as oneself” (p. 81) – an attribute more likely to be aligned to “with” framing than “against” framing. Second, a comment by Watson that Sea Shepherd gathers enemies faster than friends (see

below), together with members' awareness that their "extreme" actions often generate criticism from more moderate environmentalists (Stuart et al., 2013), suggests there may be untapped sources of potential members who would be comfortable with no-compromise direct action if it were framed as "with" rather than "against." Third, a 2018 analysis by Bargheer of the German nature conservation group Naturschutzbund Deutschland (NABU), founded in 1899 as the League for Bird Protection, argued that, though apocalyptic and war framing of environmental risks of nuclear energy increased the organization's popularity during the Cold War, the framing's appeal was situational and short term. NABU later changed its communications strategies in favour of "with" communication, including establishing an impressive national birdwatching scheme and educating in nurturing activities such as erecting bird feeders and nesting boxes. The scheme remains the organization's principal strategy for attracting new members and increasing environmental awareness (Bargheer, 2018: 987) and, by 2016, NABU had become "the largest membership organisation in the field of nature conservation and environmentalism" in Germany, surpassing Greenpeace (Bargheer, 2018, p. 988).

This study's intention certainly is not to argue against the necessity for radicalism in these times. To the contrary, we are interested in understanding how today's environmental radical activism might be most invitational in bringing about widespread transformation. In what follows, we situate this case within wider extant literature about organized direct environmental activism, representation, and Sea Shepherd in particular. We then provide context within the case of Sea Shepherd's activism history and founder Watson's stated strategic intentions in representing that activism. We illustrate the organization's contemporary online positioning by analysing

the discourse of its web presence and supporter emails. We close by exploring ways reconfigurative self-representation might be put into practice to inform more ecoculturally reflective and inclusive direct environmental action discourses that could shepherd the public toward reimagining nature-society-spaces “otherwise.”

Sea Shepherd: Constructing Protest

We focus on Sea Shepherd as our case study because, though founded in the same era as many other formatively radical environmental organizations, the organization also experienced a unique opportunity for representational transformation as it entered its third decade – an occasion that offered potential for performing environmental activism differently for mass audiences in new venues. In 2008, public exposure to, and interest in, the organization’s activities and tactics increased dramatically when the cable television channel Animal Planet began broadcasting the reality show *Whale Wars*. The show, created from footage of Sea Shepherd’s pursuit of – and encounters with – Japanese whalers in the Southern Ocean, attracted a large and broad audience and interest of scholars concerned with media construction of environmental activism, anti-whaling, and political conflict (Besel and Besel, 2010; Crouch and Damjanov, 2011; Kato, 2015; McHendry, 2012; Russill, 2009). *Whale Wars* also drew the attention of political scientists, sociologists, criminologists, and legal experts, resulting in investigations of radical environmentalism and identity (Cianchi, 2015; Nagtzaam, 2017; Stuart et al., 2013), activism and international law (Humphreys and Smith, 2011; Moffa, 2012; Nagtzaam, 2014, 2017; Nagtzaam and Lentini, 2007), and political violence (Nagtzaam, 2014, 2017; Nagtzaam and Lentini, 2007).

This transdisciplinary interest speaks to the explanatory value and constitutive capacity of image events – highly visual actions, often staged, that disrupt the media in ways that help transform particular issues into matters of public concern. In the opening pages of DeLuca's (1999) *Image Politics* – the generative work on image events – Watson, in his own words, is highly attuned to their representational power:

The drama translates into exposure. Then you tie the message into that exposure and fire it into the brains of millions of people in the process. (p. 5)

DeLuca quoted the above comment again in 2002 when he and Peeples refined image event theory by analysing symbolic and material violence enacted during protests outside the 1999 World Trade Organization conference in Seattle. Here, the image event not only was aimed at getting activists' message to distracted audiences via news media hungry for drama and conflict but also served as a contested moment "wherein several groups competed over its meaning" and violence was "a type of 'communication'" (DeLuca and Peeples, 2002). Over the past two decades, violence as communication entered the entertainment genre. In *Whale Wars*, Sea Shepherd and Animal Planet became co-constructors, moulding conflict on the Southern Ocean into reality television that served interests of both activist and corporation (McHendry, 2012; Russill, 2009).

Analysing events in Seattle, DeLuca and Peeples (2002) found "symbolic violence and uncivil disobedience in concert produced compelling images that functioned as the dramatic leads for substantive discussions of the issues" (p. 139). When McHendry (2012) examined *Whale Wars* programs and promos a decade later,

he demonstrated that Sea Shepherd's arrangement with Animal Planet was predicated on the inevitability that "the creative use of dramatic events to gain public attention is always already beholden to the agendas of the outlets that disseminate an image event" (McHendry, 2012). Without a news media visual "war," there could be no *Whale Wars*.

Public and scholarly debate about whether ecotage (property damage by environmentalists) constitutes violence or ecoterrorism is extensive yet unresolved (Nagtzaam, 2017). Such labels, however, clearly serve political purposes of radical environmentalists' targets. In response to characterizations of Sea Shepherd as a violent organization, Watson often argues the organization's actions are directed at property rather than humans. Yet Watson also maintains there is value in "maintain[ing] an image of violence" (Lester, 2011).

Sea Shepherd is not alone among environmental groups in embracing militaristic framing with connotations of violence, including framings of "war," "guerrilla," "revolutionary," "freedom fighters," etc. Earth First!, Earth Liberation Front, and Animal Liberation Front are just a few examples of international environmental groups associated with this kind of self-representation (Nagtzaam, 2017). Moreover, in decades of forestry conflict in Australia's state of Tasmania, activists have deployed war, military, and apocalyptic terminology to frame ways corporations, and specifically Forestry Tasmania, treat the environment (Lester, 2007; McGaurr, 2015); and journalists have adopted the phrase "forest wars" to describe the conflict, with headlines such as "Forest war rages within splintered peace process" (Arndt, 2012). Relatedly, climate protection activists and politicians are readily

adopting war and military metaphors and analogies to rally public concern and support – and news media reproduce these framings (Yoder, 2018).

While Sea Shepherd has centrally employed war and military framing in self-representation, the organization also has built its identity “around seemingly paradoxical principles of noncriminal piracy, compassionate wrath, and aggressive nonviolence” in defence of its wild “clients” (Stuart et al., 2013). This compassionate yet nonetheless aggressive framing can exacerbate conflicts when practices in question are regarded by some as traditional or sustenance-based, such as whaling in Japan or the Faroe Islands – particularly if confrontations are justified as defending individual animals rather than species (Brigham, 2017). Opponents of environmental direct-action often retaliate with discourse that foregrounds cultural priorities and entitlements and disparages activists’ arguments as emotional, sentimental, irrational, or even spurious and really focused on boosting funding through confrontational and continuous campaigns focused on high-profile species (Blok, 2008, 2011; Kalland, 2009; Singleton, 2016).

Conflicting or otherwise dissimilar representations are contextually dependent. Sea Shepherd’s coherence of self as a militaristic protector of cetaceans or piratical enemy of those who threaten oceanic wildlife occurs within specific arenas. At the personal level, it can be challenging for environmentalists engaged in direct action to negotiate the identity terrain between the kind of radicalism that lends itself to frames, on one end, of militarism, piracy (with its popular meaning of illegal violence), ecoterrorism (violence with the end goal of environmental protection), or vigilantism, and, on the other, passionate, caring, moral, or spiritual ecocentrism (which recognizes

the ecosphere as having centrality instead of humans) (Cianchi, 2015; McGregor, 2004; Nagtzaam, 2017; Nagtzaam and Lentini, 2007; Stuart et al., 2013). And activists may experience what della Porter (1995) calls “double marginalization,” being rejected by both the wider community and more moderate environmental organizations (della Porter (1995) in Stuart et al., 2013), while simultaneously having to manage their own grief at the suffering of those they seek to defend (Cianchi, 2015). Watson, in this vein, represents Sea Shepherd members as distinctively passionate (Stuart et al., 2013) – a characterization grounded in “doing” something to make a tangible difference borne out in interviews with individual activists. Sea Shepherd members typically distinguish themselves on the basis that their own passion results in direct action that saves wildlife while they dismiss Greenpeace’s witness-based actions as ineffectual (Stuart et al., 2013)

This emphasis on passion connected with environmental direct action suggests there are possibilities for communicating an ethos of care and cooperation – a *with* framing that might more accurately represent organizational aims and more productively serve interests of those Sea Shepherd and other direct action organizations seek to assist rather than the *against* framing with which these organizations often are strongly aligned. Here, Plumwood’s (1997) liberation critique of anthropocentrism offers insight. Plumwood critiques forms of rationality that see wildlife and ecosystems in instrumental terms and argues instead for a care and relationality approach. For Plumwood, such a philosophy brings about empathetic appreciation of interdependency and ultimately achieves systemic change through contesting human mastery. To do this transformative work necessitates voicing other species’ perspectives:

So we speak not instead of, or in the place of, nature but as interpreters of its distress and joy, for those who, often because of the human-centred framework I have sketched, are unable to see or hear these things for themselves (Plumwood, 1977, p. 351).

Milstein (2011) adds an *ecological-individual* framework to this conversation to reflect and maximize advocacy potential. In examining a case of public perception transformation surrounding endangered cetaceans, Milstein illustrates how, within a ecosystemic-singular dialectic, members of a species are emplaced within their ecosystems and at the same time recognized as having intrinsic value as individuals, amplifying interconnected more-than-human voices. The amplification of these voices can establish a powerful discursive framework for a recognizable and actionable interdependent set of ecocultural traits, experiences, and impacts.

As the next section will show, in addition to aggressive opposition to whalers, sealers, and illegal fishers, Sea Shepherd, like some other formatively radical environmental organizations, has a rich history of working *with* wildlife, ecosystems, other organizations, and governments to achieve its aims. Also, as well as drama and conflict on the high seas, its image-event repertoire is distinguished by examples directly demonstrating intimacy and care. There are many sides to Sea Shepherd and other formatively radical environmental organizations that in aggregate may be more transformatively representatively aligned *with* the diversity and complexity of the more-than-human world than the simplified *against* framing of *Whale Wars* and other long-time aggressive and militaristic self-representations.

Sea Shepherd Contexts and Trajectory from Conception to Middle-age

Nagtzaam (2017) notes that radical environmental organizations often emerge out of dissatisfaction with operational styles of other organizations. This is evident in Sea Shepherd's early formation as a reaction against Greenpeace's approach. Watson's career as an activist began in the early 1970s in the group of media-savvy environmental activists who formed Greenpeace and famously confronted a Soviet whaling fleet off the coast of California in 1975, placing their motored inflatable boats between whaler harpoons and whales. Footage of the encounter generated widespread publicity and donations. Within two years, however, the Greenpeace board had expelled Watson for what it described as too aggressive behaviour, sparking a continued animosity: Greenpeace denies Watson's foundational role in the organization, and Watson regularly decries Greenpeace's policy of "bearing witness" as opposed to acting.

Watson launched Earthforce, Sea Shepherd's precursor, soon after he and Greenpeace parted ways. By 1981, when Sea Shepherd was officially registered as a charity, Watson and crew had mounted campaigns against Spanish and Portuguese whalers, Canadian sealers, and elephant poachers in Kenya, Tanzania, Somalia, Uganda, and Sudan. The early years were punctuated by high drama confrontations that would become the organization's hallmark. From the outset, however, there also were less confrontational actions, such as raising money to buy a Scottish island as a haven for seals, successful negotiations to end a dolphin hunt at Japan's Iki Island, and removals of drift nets in the Aleutian Islands.

The breadth of Sea Shepherd's collaborative networks expanded in the 1990s, when it joined the Trinidad and Tobago Coast Guard to combat Taiwanese longliners and supported protests against clear-cutting in British Columbia. Also in the 1990s, Sea Shepherd began successful deployment of celebrities – a tactic we discuss below. At the same time, the organization demonstrated ambivalence toward some Indigenous aspirations. Whereas in 1991 it actively supported cultural campaigns of North American First Nations people, in 1995 it actively opposed the Makah tribe's efforts to revive its whale hunt in Washington state (van Ginkel, 2004).

Sea Shepherd's annual engagement of the Japanese whaling fleet began in 2002 and became increasingly visible during the 2007-2010 southern hemisphere summers. In 2008, the organization sent an Australian and a British activist to board the *Yushin Maru 2*, where they subsequently were held by whalers, sparking intervention of the Australian government. After 48 hours, an Australian customs vessel transported the two back to Sea Shepherd's vessel *Steve Irwin*.² In early 2009, the Japanese whaling fleet – now armed with water cannons, long range acoustic weapons, and enhanced public relations expertise – regularly moved closer to *Steve Irwin* and monitored the activists' movements. The summer of 2009-2010 was marked by collisions with Japanese vessels, including the sinking of Sea Shepherd's flashy trimaran *Ady Gil* and a collision between the *Yushin Maru 3* and the group's newest vessel, named after donor

² As an example of Brockington's (2009) celebrity-conservation capitalist alliance, the *Steve Irwin*, as with other Sea Shepherd vessels, is named after a celebrity. Irwin was an Australian zookeeper turned wild animal/conservation celebrity who in many ways drove the spectacularization of nature documentaries that led to Animal Planet's style of representation.

US television personality Bob Barker. In mid-February, the *Ady Gil's* (now vessel-less) captain, New Zealander Pete Bethune, boarded and was detained on the Japanese whaler *Shonan Maru 2* and later was formally arrested and held in Japan for five months.

While some mainstream environmentalists are irritated by Sea Shepherd's methods, others argue such radicalism results in moderate environmental groups getting a better hearing (Nagtzaam, 2017). Sea Shepherd, on the other hand, prides itself on its ability to directly protect wildlife. Like Watson, members express frustration with other organizations that do not directly intervene (Stuart et al., 2013).

It is important to recognize, however, that, whereas Sea Shepherd frames some other organizations as antithetical to direct action and more moderate organizations may decry yet benefit from Sea Shepherd's approach, neither direct action nor witness approaches, in a broader sense, exclusively employ *with* or *against* frames. Certainly, while direct action with focus on conflict and an enemy can be a prime example of *against* framing, the same direct action can draw attention to alignments with species, governments, and peoples and exemplify *with* framing. This conceptual openness underpins the potential for more dialogic development in *against* and *with* frames for transformative collaborative action in ecological protection and public reimagining.

At the height of Sea Shepherd's Southern Ocean campaigns, images of clashes between its vessels and the Japanese fleet regularly appeared in news media and in the hugely popular *Whale Wars*. Yet, despite the actions' popularity, questions arose about the ability of such confrontational campaigns to sway contemporary publics and

governments. Dauvergne and Neville (2011) argue Westerners are becoming inured to graphic images and, thus, less susceptible to emotional campaigns. Others challenge the strategic wisdom of Sea Shepherd's pirate symbolism. In the Faroe Islands, where the group has a long history of opposing the traditional, bloody *grindadráp* whale hunt, the film documentary *Islands and the Whales* represents the organization's skull and crossbones as distressing locals and counterproductive (Gardiner, 2017). In Japan, where the government may fear successful action against whaling could lead to foreign interference in other marine issues (McKie, 2017), it seems likely Western anti-whaling activism has contributed to a nationalistic "anti-anti-whaling" discourse (Kato, 2015). Far from shaming the government into submission, dramatic confrontations between Sea Shepherd and whalers on the high seas were countered by an increased state militarization of whaling. The Japanese government deployed sophisticated satellite surveillance and enacted laws against anti-whaling activism of such severity that in 2017 Sea Shepherd abandoned its more than decade-long Southern Ocean campaign. At the time, Watson took to the internet in a rare moment of defensiveness:

Last year we were criticized by some former supporters and crew for not finding them when the reality is that we could not possibly engage them. Now we are being criticized by the same few people for not sending our ships south this season. Criticized for sending them and not finding them last year and criticized for not sending ships this year. To continue would be foolish. We would spend a few million dollars and many months only to have another failure to engage, and if we did by some miracle encounter the fleet, we would be subject to lethal force without support from our own cowardly governments. (Watson, 2017a)

Sea Shepherd's Representational Strategy

In 2009, when Sea Shepherd was perhaps the most visible global environmental NGO, Lester (2011) interviewed Watson in Hobart, Tasmania. At the time, the organization's fleet was using Australia's Hobart port to launch its annual Southern Ocean-based campaigns against Japanese whaling. Lester, in part, focused on ways Watson's reluctance to describe what Sea Shepherd does as protest may have been fundamental to the group's mediated visibility. Watson instead represents Sea Shepherd as existing to intervene and as an uncompromising, unpredictable, and, therefore, potentially dangerous organization, strategically walking a fine line:

...to make sure that we don't break the law but we walk very close to breaking the law; certainly that we don't injure anybody. It's good to maintain an image of aggressiveness; it's good even to maintain an image of violence, in a way – as long as you don't actually hurt anybody.

Sea Shepherd, however, deliberately does break the law in some cases as part of its strategy, such as in the Faroes (Singleton, 2016), and Watson has been a fugitive based on an Interpol arrest warrant. From early on, "piracy" was applied by those critical of Sea Shepherd's activities. Watson explained to Lester that he embraced this label because it framed the organization as a genuine threat:

They call us pirates so we think, why not? The Dalai Lama once told me ... about the compassionate aspect of Buddha's wrath and I asked what he meant. He said, "Well you never want to hurt anybody but sometimes when they can't see enlightenment then scare the hell out of them until they do." So we get this image. The great thing about our image is that our enemies begin to believe their own propaganda. The stuff on the Internet is incredible. I've got

AK47s and I've shot people and I've done all this stuff. Of course I haven't done any of that stuff but it doesn't matter as long as they believe it. So when we show up our job is a lot easier. They just run and keep running and we keep pursuing them. So the ships are black and the Jolly Roger is there for that reason.

An important element in mediated visibility is the capacity, in relative terms, to control the physical site, events, and, thus, informational flow of the conflict. The Southern Ocean's remote and difficult location combined with the extended nature of voyages ensured few journalists witnessed events first-hand, instead relying on Sea Shepherd's communications specialists and information supplied by the Japanese government. Watson stated he understood, however, that in a "world overwhelmed with images," it was "harder and harder to impress people," and thus speed and timely presentation of events became paramount. Animal Planet's eight-person camera crew filming *Whale Wars* provided footage of confrontations for immediate transmission, the precise amount of which had been negotiated prior to the summer voyages.

Watson also identified celebrity as one of "four things that the media understands really," along with sex, scandal, and violence. In 1984, for example, Sea Shepherd recruited Bo Derek to campaign to stop aerial shooting of wolves in British Columbia:

At the press conference, which was packed, a reporter from the Vancouver Sun said, "What does Bo Derek know about wolves?" And I said, "That is not the point. Have you just graduated from journalism school or something? I could have the best wolf biologist in the world here and I'd have an empty

room. But the fact that she's our spokesperson means the place is packed and it will be the headline in your newspaper tomorrow."

Brockington (2009) argues celebrity-conservation cause alliances provide mutually supportive publicity and are symptomatic of an intertwining corporate capitalism and conservation that commodify and commercialize environmental protection. While using celebrities is not unusual, what is uncommon is Watson could draw on the resources of an industry inextricably connected to a system (capitalism) against which he continuously railed, but not be accused of hypocrisy. Rather, he framed and continues to frame celebrity use in such a way that reinforces his "whatever it takes" reputation.

Overall, Lester (2011) remained ambivalent about the long-term sustainability of Sea Shepherd's visibility. History tells us high profile media access is rare for environmental activists, requiring a complex negotiation of meanings and symbols, professional practices, transnational politics, and mediated trajectories and flows. Despite or because of the rise of the internet and social media, Sea Shepherd remained vulnerable to dynamics that have left other radical environmental groups trivialized and marginalised, labelled deviant and dangerous, or, worst of all, boring.

Analysing Mid-Life Environmental Activism Representational Strategy

Against this backdrop, about a decade after Lester's Watson interview and about 40 years into the organization's tenure, our present study examines the current tenor and scope of Sea Shepherd's self-representations in the contemporary online sphere. Analysing publicly accessible content featured from 2016 until 2019 on Sea Shepherd's international and Australia public web sites, as well as its Southern Ocean

campaign-specific web site,³ and its fundraising email appeals to supporters during this same timeframe, we use discourse analysis methodology (Carbaugh, 2007; Fairclough, 2009) to first identify ways Sea Shepherd has continuously communicated a no-compromise direct action self-framing with whales at its centre. In addition, we examine ways the organization's representational tenor, such as an emphasis on timeliness and overarching piracy and militaristic framing, have risked obscuring and working against wider relevance. Finally, we explore ways different choices of representation might expand the scope for increasingly reflective transformative force and reach, and highlight ways Sea Shepherd appears to be embracing some of these choices in 2019 as it adjusts to the cessation of its high profile anti-whaling campaign and takes on new tactics in reaching supporters.

A Direct Action Stance and Multiple Versions of Whales

Sea Shepherd's online representation continues to broadcast a core aggressive direct action stance. The organization forefronts *acting* as central to its self-definition and as differentiating itself from other environmental activist organizations – namely, Greenpeace – which it continued to dismiss as merely protest-focused and, therefore, inadequate in bringing about transformation (e.g., <https://www.seashepherd.org.au/news-and-commentary/commentary/sea-shepherd-and-greenpeace-an-unfortunate-conflict.html>). Embedded in the direct action framing was an uncompromising approach, highlighted in a variety of forms, including vivid

³ Sea Shepherd's international web site is www.seashepherdglobal.org. Its Australia site is <http://www.seashepherd.org.au/> and the Australia site's Southern Ocean campaign specific site was <http://www.seashepherd.org.au/relentless/>.

examples of Sea Shepherd's most aggressive actions, such as scuttling poaching ships. Relatedly, Sea Shepherd forefronted the legality of its direct actions and the illegality of those it acts to stop, serving as both justification and rationale and positioning the organization as legitimate enforcer of international conservation laws otherwise not enforced (<https://seashepherd.org/laws-and-charters/>).

On-line representation also had practical focus on the effects of the organization's direct actions. For example, Southern Ocean campaign representation often explicitly numbered a count of whale lives saved each anti-whaling campaign (e.g., 769 whale lives in 2011-2012) (<https://www.seashepherdglobal.org/latest-news/whale-defense-campaign-history/>) and took credit for amount of monetary profit lost by Japanese companies hunting whales and the Japanese government ("tens of millions of dollars" over the years of Sea Shepherd saving "lives of over 6,000 whales") (<https://seashepherd.org/2018/12/21/japan-may-quit-the-iwc-and-to-return-to-commercial-whaling/>). This pairing of lives saved and corporate profit lost is especially effective in communicating economic drives of ocean wildlife hunts as in conflict with Japan's cultural, scientific, or sovereignty justifications for whaling.

Though whales have been Sea Shepherd's most high-profile work, they are by no means inclusive of its scope of actions. From establishment, actions have been diverse and far-reaching in terms of species, ecosystems, and world regions. Still, even after cessation of its Southern Hemisphere whale campaign starting 2017-2018, Sea Shepherd has consistently used self-representation that communicates the centrality of cetaceans to its cause. And its logo, a crossed shepherd's staff and trident (with dolphin

within trident) and a jolly roger skull with whale and dolphin as a yin-yang in the skull's mind, continues to overshadow its efforts in defense of other oceanic species. *Whale Wars*, too, served to centralize whales in popular knowledge about Sea Shepherd. Coinciding with Watson's understanding of media celebrity interest, the organization's cetacean focus tends to have a celebrity tone – with whales and dolphins as featured charismatic megafauna species, as the stars of their ecosystems.

In addition to celebrity framing, different agentic work is apparent in attempts to ascribe subjectivity to cetaceans and other wildlife – and to communicate that it is the wildlife to whom Sea Shepherd answers. One predominant example is a legal tenor adopted by referring to cetaceans and other wildlife as “our clients” (<https://www.seashepherd.org.au/who-we-are/about-us/equality-statement.html>). While this framing leaves out the ecological pole of the ecological-individual dialectic, it takes a step toward representing cetaceans with a level of autonomy and rights.

The organization produces additional framings of cetaceans that at times can be in conflict with each other or Sea Shepherd's core mission and aims. As we exhibit below, whales (and other ocean life) may mistakenly be interpreted as those being shepherded by Sea Shepherd, connoting human mastery, domestication, and subservience. In addition, whales (and other ocean life) are represented as those the organization is going to war over because they cannot fight for themselves (as exhibited, for instance, in a Sea Shepherd promotional image depicting a humpback whale as a B-12 military fighter plane with accompanying text: “Until they can defend themselves, we will do it for them.”). Sea Shepherd also has represented ocean life as those receiving gifts (e.g., a 1992 scuttling of a whaling ship is described as a “gift to

the whales”) (<https://www.seashepherd.org.au/who-we-are/our-history.html>) and those being saved.

Ongoing Effective Partnerships vs. Timely Newsy Campaigns

Whereas became clear in our analysis that Sea Shepherd consistently has communicated an uncompromising direct action stance and centralized cetaceans as its core symbol, we also are interested in what may be representatively absent, what may be counterproductive, and where may lie opportunities for new representational directions.. As stated, though Sea Shepherd is widely known for its (now halted) Southern Ocean whale work, it is less known for its other actions, which, from the beginning, have been diverse and far-reaching. Part of this lopsided public perception is due to the range and networked nature of the organization’s actions often being lost behind high profile featured campaigns.

Organized environmental activism must communicate capacities to network (with governments, organizations, stakeholders) and a breadth and depth of actions. Representing diverse actions as interlinked serves to reflect the wider ecological systems an organization acts to protect and the wider social systems it works to influence and transform. Just as Watson emphasized in his interview a decade earlier, analysis of Sea Shepherd’s more contemporary online self-representation revealed continued focus on single-issue timely campaigns. Whereas this atomized focus may appeal to conventional news outlets, in terms of self-representation to an already-interested public seeking information from source, this narrow scope lends to a fragmented view of an organization’s actions and largely leaves out ways campaigns tie

together in terms of mission and interrelated ecological and social systems. In the process of highlighting timely campaigns, the diverse nature of actions – and the networking of these actions within wider imbricated systems – is obscured.

For Sea Shepherd, such ongoing community-engaged, less flashy work often has been backstaged to the more known, conflict-focused whale protection work. For instance, the organization has a successful track record of working with Global South governments and communities to provide legal enforcement support. One example is its conservation patrol in the Ecuadorian Galapagos Islands reserves: Sea Shepherd organizes a K-9 unit in partnership with the Ecuadorian National Police to sniff out smuggled shark fins and sea cucumbers at ports and airports. Such work is nonaggressive, ongoing, and even un-newsy, but it is in such partnerships some of the organization's more interesting and impactful work affecting socio-ecological systems takes place.

War, Military, Piracy Framing

Relatedly, we are interested in ways Sea Shepherd's longstanding piracy, military, and war framing appears central to Watson's representational intentions from its early years and continues to be central to the organization today. A sampling of Watson's book titles include *Earthforce! An Earth Warrior's Guide to Strategy* (Watson, 1993), *Ocean Warrior: My Battle to End the Illegal Slaughter on the High Seas* (Watson, 1995), and *Seal Wars: Twenty-five Years on the Front Lines with the Harp Seals* (Watson, 2003). Today's war framing is reproduced in Sea Shepherd titling

of its campaigns using the military convention of “operations” and painting many of its ships in military camouflage.

War framing connotes an enemy against whom one must fight and can be effective in provoking fear in one’s adversaries and speaking to a particular urge (to varying degrees in many of us) to fight back against species and ecological destruction. War symbolism, however, also carries well-earned cultural baggage. War is viewed by many as unjust, capital-driven, and avoidable, as well as violently destructive and as having “no winners.” Singleton (2016) argues that, whereas Sea Shepherd’s actions seek to win a conflict, the activists also contribute to the enactment of that conflict and, with “an identity and support based on an unwillingness to compromise, it is difficult for them to participate in dialogue...” (p. 41).

At the same time, militaristic and war representations can feed into opposition framing. For instance, when Japanese whalers got the story out first, their framing presented Sea Shepherd as violent, attacking them, and – based on size and power discrepancy – an ecoterrorist organization. In addition, as war framing requires an enemy, more powerful designated enemies (such as nation states) likely will more powerfully engage in their side of the confrontation and seemingly emerge victorious.

Relatedly, Sea Shepherd’s pirate self-framing appears to have increased over the years. As Watson stated in Lester’s interview, this representation may make the organization’s work easier as it is read as a genuine threat. Watson’s 2008 film biography was titled *Pirate for the Sea* and Sea Shepherd’s logo over the years shifted from featuring a large humpback whale and smaller cetacean against a blue circle and

the words “Sea Shepherd Conservation Society” to the current jolly roger with cetaceans in the brain. This instantly recognizable black and white pirate logo features prominently on the organization’s web sites, on staff and volunteer gear, and on many of the organization’s boats. While appreciating the publicity value of pirate framing, Stuart and his colleagues (2013) found Sea Shepherd members also were aware that large swathes of the public react negatively to it and even regard them as “criminals” (p. 764). Piracy self-framing also clearly can work in direct conflict with Sea Shepherd’s practical aims and representations of being non-violent law enforcers working to stop those breaking the law at sea.

An Argument for Nurturance, Ecological, and Guardianship Framing

Above, we illustrate how a high visibility activist organization such as Sea Shepherd can be efficacious in getting its actions in front of the public, yet at the same time make representational choices that overshadow or risk obscuring wider organizational mission and goals. Perhaps most strikingly, whereas Sea Shepherd’s mission is to be guardian of wildlife and habitats, war and piracy framing may distort this in public perception and a focus on celebrity and news values may eclipse important interlinked ecological and species protection goals. Based on its mission statement,⁴ our discourse analysis of its current web sites, and extant research on the organization, we argue nurturance, ecological care, and guardianship are core to Sea

⁴ From Sea Shepherd’s mission statement (Sea Shepherd Global, 2018): “Our mission is to protect defenseless marine wildlife and end the destruction of habitat in the world’s oceans. Since 1977, Sea Shepherd has used innovative direct action tactics to defend, conserve and protect the delicately-balanced biodiversity of our seas and enforce international conservation laws...From the gentle giants of the sea to its smallest creatures, Sea Shepherd’s mission is to protect all marine life species living in our oceans.”

Shepherd's aims, as well as to volunteer and supporter reasons for being involved with this and other direct action environmental organizations, and that *with*, ecological-individual, and guardian framing could be forefronted in reconfigurative ways.

From Against to With

In order to overcome self-representation limitations, we argue, instead of, or in addition to, militaristic *against* framing, Sea Shepherd – and other environmental activist organizations – have the opportunity to communicate a transformative emphasis on working *with* (wildlife, ecosystems, communities, organizations, governments). This can be achieved in ways that more succinctly represent organizational missions and interlinked actions and at the same time avoid problematic reproductions and naturalizations of war, militarism, piracy, and corporate values, and their destructive entailments.

Framing based on nurturance, ecological relations, and guardianship could accurately and inclusively reflect Sea Shepherd's ongoing networked goals and actions, and *with* framing could speak to broader concerned populations far more interested in no compromise direct actions clearly based on and motivated by love than by war. Further, such self-representation can already be found, with some digging, in Sea Shepherd's backgrounded online presence. For instance, backstaged in its web history timeline page are images of Watson from an early direct action against Canadian sealing. These images depict the organization's early seal brushing campaign, which aimed to model an alternative to clubbing seals for collecting fur. The images feature a slightly surprised seal resting on the ice while a happy-looking Watson and volunteer

brush her fur to collect in bags, and Watson cuddling a baby seal on the ice on the cover of his 2002 book *Seal Wars* (<https://www.seashepherd.org.au/who-we-are/our-history.html>). The images provide stark contrast to those people clubbing seals who Sea Shepherd aimed to stop. At the same time, the brushing and cuddling imagery starkly contrasts Watson's AK-47 pirate persona ascribed by critics and strategically taken on by the organization.

Brushing seals, sleeping next to seals to protect them from sealers, or aligning with local Indigenous elders and less powerful governments – all actions taken by Sea Shepherd and represented on its history timeline – do not align, however, with timeliness and violence imperatives described by Watson and accelerated by online news values. Whereas Sea Shepherd's dominant militaristic and piracy self-representation have done specific work in communicating its stance of being the most aggressive and feared defender of wildlife in the oceans, these predominant representations also at times may stand in the way of *with* framing and sentiments that often motivate people to do ecological and wildlife activist work (Cianchi, 2015; Stuart et al., 2013).

From Stand-Alone Species to Individuals within Interrelated Ecosystems

Though cetaceans remain central to Sea Shepherd's symbolism, the organization's online representational strategies often do not clearly articulate how whales, dolphins, and porpoises represent its wider mission and the ecological embeddedness of its actions. Instead, in addition to the celebrity focus on cetaceans, the organization's self-representations directly or indirectly communicate an array of at

times conflicting framings of cetaceans and other ocean life: as “clients,” as those being shepherded, as those Sea Shepherd is going to war over, as those being saved, or as those receiving gifts. Largely missing is how cetaceans and other wildlife are interrelated and interdependent individuals and species, relational ecological positionalities that could help better explain and bolster Sea Shepherd’s cause with wider audiences.

Through a lack of holistic *ecological-individual* contextualization, the organization risks producing notions of whales as at the top of an oceanic and cultural hierarchy. This framing disaggregates instead of unites. In contrast, an ecological-individual framing (Milstein, 2011) situates species as interconnected actors in complex systems wherein interdependence is predicated on the individuality and relationships of each actor within. Indeed, Sea Shepherd and other environmental activist organizations ostensibly exist to undo imagined hierarchies, and bring attention to all wildlife and habitats at anthropogenic risk. In clearly representing how the health and thriving of individual cetaceans intimately relates to other species and places it works to protect, the organization could represent ecological interdependency more vividly and consistently, implicating not only certain species but entire interrelated ecosystems each time its actions are at the forefront in media coverage and public minds.

From Shepherd to Guardian

In addition to *with* and ecological-individual framing, choosing and consistently using core framing that situates ocean animals as agentic forces who do not need shepherding but do need guardianship to be protected from accelerated profit-driven

transnational human wrongdoing would aid the activist cause. Self-representation ambiguity is found in confusing, even anthropocentric connotations within Sea Shepherd's very name – at a basic level, who is the herder and who are the sheep? The dominant anthropocentric meaning of “shepherd” – humans shepherding nonhumans – does not align with the organization's mission of both protecting wild animals and also leaving them free to be.

Most, if not all, the organization's direct action examples, however, are guardianship-focused. The lack of representational clarity around the organization's core symbol, its name, indicates ways deeply embedded hierarchical ecocultural discourses often are unconsciously reproduced even in radical organized environmental activist self-representation (McGregor, 2004) – forefronting dominant discourses (including anthropocentrism, militarism, androcentrism, capitalism) and backgrounding counterdiscourses with which such organizations strongly align (including guardianship, nurturance, ecological interrelationship, and ecocultural responsibility). This dissonance is reflected in Watson's paradoxical claims of “aggressive non-violence” and “compassionate wrath” unpacked by Stuart et al (2013) and Sea Shepherd participants' emphasis on “passion,” “caring,” and “compassion” (p. 767).

We argue the organization's actions could be more transformatively represented as shepherding *one's own flock* (humans) away from harassing, harming, and slaughtering oceanic wildlife and toward caring ecological and species actions. Explicitly framing its shepherding in this flipped way would not only represent the organization as a guardian but also symbolically usher in a shift in human praxis that Sea Shepherd attempts through direct action. Such reframing would both reflect and

serve the organization's no-compromise stance of defending the oceans as shepherding human right action and curtailing wrong action.

In increasing a guardianship focus and forefronting the symbolism of shepherding one's own species – and lessening focus on militarization and piracy – Sea Shepherd would not lose the edge it may maintain in being perceived as tough or potentially violent, and *against* actions would still have their place. Simultaneously, guardianship and self-shepherding actions carry *with* connotations of sociocultural and ecological responsibility and potential for cross-cultural collaboration. Indeed, many enduring Indigenous communities long have understood themselves as guardians and the public is seeing protector framing rise in mainstream consciousness (Dare and Fletcher, 2018; Tipa, 2009).

Representing the Next 40 Years of Environmental Activism

Sea Shepherd is not alone in its representational challenges. Both formatively radical and mainstream environmental activist organizations often must draw from the material-symbolic discourses they ostensibly exist to dismantle (McGaurr and Lester, 2017; McGregor, 2004). And, as environmental organizations grow and age, this tendency, even seeming necessity, to take on dominant discourses and, as a result, to reify these discourses in their own self-representation may be difficult to shake. We argue, however, that a shaking up – and a reconstituting – may be precisely what is needed at this synchronized moment of contemporary organizational environmentalist maturity and planetary endangerment.

Whereas the *against* approach can be effective in some instances, taking on a violent persona and its associated entailments also can reproduce the very mastery and binary premises ecological and wildlife protection organizations ostensibly are created to undo. Indeed, such framing of actions can help fuel support for draconian measures – in Sea Shepherd’s case, for example, Japan’s new whaling law and increased military presence in the Southern Ocean paired with governmental monetary support for “fighting back” against perceived incursions against rights and sovereignty, followed most recently by Japan withdrawing from the International Whaling Commission (IWC) so it is no longer subject to the IWC ban and, in July 2019, launching its first baldly commercial whaling in 30 years (*BBC News*, 2019; Dooley and Ueno, 2019).

Few audiences, volunteers, and donors attracted by depictions of conflict on the high seas are likely to be entirely without boundaries where violence is concerned. Sea Shepherd is funded by donations of money and supplies, crowdsourcing, and the sale of merchandise (Sea Shepherd Global, 2019). In 2015, at the height of *Whale Wars* on the Southern Ocean and onscreen, *The Guardian* reported that Sea Shepherd “experienced record fundraising” (Enders, 2015). But this also was a year in which the organization was fighting multi-million-dollar legal battles with Ady Gil over the sinking of the ship he had lent it for those very actions, and defending itself against criticism from former deputy CEO Chuck Swift. Swift told *The Guardian* he “resigned to save his integrity” (Swift, in Enders, 2015) and implied that fundraising could be compromised by actions perceived as unethical:

I think to have an effective win for the whales or for the environment, and to be able to stand proudly in front of our donors or the public, we need to have accomplished that victory in an ethical way. (Swift, in Enders, 2015)

Not only can *against* framing feed into posturing that results not in saving lives but losing them, but the “operations” that sustain it also can compromise the financial viability it is meant to help secure. Sea Shepherd appears to recognize this – as discussed, when Japan forcefully resumed commercial whaling in the Southern Ocean in 2017 after a one-year hiatus, Sea Shepherd was outpowered and its regional protection of whales rendered ineffective. At the same time, Sea Shepherd also announced it would no longer send a crew to Taiji, Japan’s notorious dolphin killing cove. This change in strategy – removing major resources from high profile cetacean campaigns and putting them toward others – however, did not leave behind militaristic self-representation. Indeed, in the Taiji announcement, Watson quotes Sun Tzu’s *The Art of War*:

Be like water, avoid what is strong and strike what is weak. There can be no constant conditions. Tactics must evolve. (Watson, 2017b)

We argue, however, that tactics in self-representation must evolve in order to spur widespread public engagement in protecting the biosphere. Organizations such as Sea Shepherd – with charismatic and controversial organizational life-long sole leaders devoted to militaristic radical action to garner attention – may have a harder time changing than others that utilize affinity cells and may be more flexible and responsive (including very new movements such as Extinction Rebellion and School Strike for Climate). However, approaching future framing more transformatively with, for

instance, *ecological-individual* and *with* identification would not only position individual wildlife and humans as imbricated members of a complex ecological tapestry, it also would anneal strength and resilience within and among broad networks (Milstein, 2011).

In its 40th year end-of-2017 fundraising email appeal to supporters, Sea Shepherd featured an image of a breaching humpback whale and the text:

Over the last 40 years, Sea Shepherd Conservation Society has grown into a worldwide movement that is dedicated to serving the oceans. Our clients are the whales, dolphins, sharks, sea lions, rays, turtles, and all other oceanic wildlife – those beings that rely on us to be their voice.

In working on behalf of other species, how activists amplify more-than-human voice informs how others hear and are moved to listen. And we note, now in its fifth decade, Sea Shepherd's representational tactics appear to be evolving. Sea Shepherd currently has provided ship and crew to team up with Canadian biologist Alexandra Morton and local Indigenous leaders researching and educating about the ills of industrial salmon farms. While the action does stick with celebrity tactics, bringing in actor Pamela Anderson to kick off the campaign, it also forefronts *ecological* and *with* framing, as seen in the organization's 2019 "June Campaign Updates - Double Your Impact Today!" email to supporters, which represented its efforts with Morton and the Tla-o-qui-aht Nation as:

to protect an entire ecosystem, not simply salmon. Salmon is a keystone species to the Pacific Northwest, meaning the entire ecosystem relies on their survival. It is for this reason, and many others, that Sea Shepherd's

Virus Hunter campaign is fervently working to shut down the open-net pen salmon farms.

Also in 2019, despite its and now Japan's retreat from the Southern Ocean conflict zone, Sea Shepherd has resurrected *Whale Wars* on screen, releasing a crowdfunded documentary that revisits the battles with the familiar emphasis on high drama but employs the voice of actor Dan Ackroyd to "relay the thoughts of the Minke Whales which are fighting for life" (BOFA Film Festival, 2019). Though tactics such as celebrity focus and military operation names still feature in these new actions, these recent campaigns may represent a concerted attempt to find a balance in representing organizational actions as working both *with* and *against*, and a move toward forefronting ecological, nurturance, and guardianship framing.

In the current context of an internet-savvy public turning away from 24-hour news media (Rosenberg and Feldman, 2008) and toward organizational self-representations (Costanza-Chock, 2012), an opportunity exists for environmental activist organizations to eschew news values that focus on conflict, violence (or threats of violence), celebrity, and timeliness. Such a shift may have a significant impact on public support for environmental activism.

Singleton (2019) argues environmental organizations that aim to move beyond well-worn conflicts and debates should focus on altering the "background frames" of the public and, in doing so, voice new narratives about the global social order to provide "the tools for frame changes and social mobilisation" (p. 172). Doing so could go a long way in affecting non-activist public perception and engagement. For instance, Klas et al. (2018) demonstrated that, whereas the public generally perceives activists as

possessing a deep care for and love of environment, and views their results as beneficial for the health of ecosystems, mediated pervasive negative connotations of aggressive or belligerent activist behavior squelches public support and turns people off from broader ecocentric messages.

Yet tensions between ways environmental activist organization representation has been done and could be done likely will remain. The following quote by Watson from Stuart et al (2013) is illustrative of this inner struggle, acknowledging the distaste some of the public has for direct action tactics, as well as exemplifying a dynamic representational tension between framing “the creatures of the sea” either as “our clients” or as “our family”:

Sea Shepherd may not be everyone’s cup of tea. We are a no-nonsense, in-your-face, activist organization that rocks the boat, upsets the status quo, and pins the bell on the rear end of corrupt and ineffective politicians. We get called names, and we recruit enemies faster than we recruit supporters, but the one thing we do better than any other organization on this planet is that *we champion and risk our lives for our clients, the creatures of the sea, as if they were our family—which when you think of it, they are* (p. 753) <emphasis added by present authors>.

The current moment provides an opportunity for environmental activist organizations to not only “think of it” but to forefront it. In forefronting *ecological-individual* and *with* framing, organizations may be able to reckon with profoundly transforming fundamental dominant ways humans not only have been perceiving but also acting toward the more-than-human world. In reconfiguring and reimagining nature-society-spaces “otherwise” (Collard et al., 2018), transformative doing must align with

transformative representing in order to subvert dominant orientations and (re)vitalize alternatives. With many of the formatively radical environmental activist organizations entering middle age at the same time the world experiences a rising awareness of anthropogenic ecological devastation, this is an especially fertile time for organizations reaching maturity to reconsider the reconfigurative force of their current representations – ranging from “fighting” for wildlife to war and military framing of climate protection (Yoder, 2018). Shepherding dominant ecocultural practices from being *against* to *with* will involve both actions and words.

Final Draft

References

- Arndt D (2012) Forest war rages within splintered peace process. *the Examiner*, 31 January. Launceston Tasmania.
- Bargheer S (2018) Apocalypse adjourned: The rise and decline of Cold War environmentalism in Germany. *Environmental Politics* 27(6): 973–993.
- Besel RD and Besel RS (2010) Whale Wars and the public screen: Mediating animal ethics in violent times. In: Goodale G and Black JE (eds) *Arguments about Animal Ethics*. Lanham: Lexington Books, pp. 163–177.
- [Blok A \(2011\) War of the Whales: Post-Sovereign Science and Agonistic Cosmopolitics in Japanese-Global Whaling. *Science, Technology, and Human Values* 36: 55–81. DOI: 10.1177/0162243910366133](#)
- [Blok A \(2008\) Contesting Global Norms: Politics of Identity in Japanese Pro-Whaling Countermobilization. *Global Environmental Politics* 8: 39–66.](#)
- BOFA Film Festival (2019) Defend Conserve Protect. Available at: <https://breath-of-fresh-air.com.au/films/defend-serve-protect/>.
- Brigham MP (2017) Chrono-Controversy: The Makah's Campaign to Resume the Whale Hunt. *Western Journal of Communication* 81(2): 243–261. DOI: 10.1080/10570314.2016.1242023.
- [Brockington D \(2009\) *Celebrity and the Environment: Fame, Wealth and Power in Conservation*. London: Zed Books.](#)
- Carbaugh D (2007) Cultural discourse analysis: Communication practices and intercultural encounters. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research* 36(3): 167–182.
- Cianchi J (2015) *Radical Environmentalism: Nature, Identity and More-than-Human Agency*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Costanza-Chock S (2012) Mic Check! Media Cultures and the Occupy Movement. *Social Movement Studies* 11(3-4): 375–385. DOI: 10.1080/14742837.2012.710746.
- Crouch D and Damjanov K (2011) Piracy up-lined: Sea Shepherd and the spectacle of protest on the high seas. In: Cottle S and Lester L (eds) *Transnational Protests and the Media*. Global Crises and the Media. New York: Peter Lang, pp. 185–196.
- Dare AM and Fletcher CV (2018) A Bird's Eye View of the Malheur Wildlife Refuge Occupation: Nonhuman Agency and Entangled Species. *Environmental*

Formatted: Font: Italic

Communication: 1–12. DOI: 10.1080/17524032.2017.1412998.

- Dauvergne P and Neville KJ (2011) Mindbombs of right and wrong: cycles of contention in the activist campaign to stop Canada's seal hunt. *Environmental Politics* 20(2): 192–209. DOI: 10.1080/09644016.2011.551024.
- DeLuca KM (1999) *Image Politics: The New Rhetoric of Environmental Activism*. New York: Routledge.
- DeLuca KM and Peebles J (2002) From Public Sphere to Public Screen: Democracy, Activism, and the 'Violence' of Seattle. *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 19(2): 125–151. DOI: 10.1080/07393180216559.
- Enders K (2015) Enders, K. (). Can Sea Shepherd survive Its own success? *The Guardian*, 5 June. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/jun/05/sea-shepherd-whale-wars-animal-planet>.
- Fairclough N (2009) *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Pearson Education.
- Gardiner K (2017) Whale Hunters Defend the Grind in 'Islands and the Whales'. Available at: <https://www.sierraclub.org/sierra/whale-hunters-defend-grind-islands-and-whales> (accessed 20 January 2018).
- Humphreys J and Smith MLR (2011) Protecting endangered species. *Criminal Justice Matters* 83(1): 6–7. DOI: 10.1080/09627251.2011.550147.
- Kato K (2015) Australia's whaling discourse: global norm, green consciousness and identity. *Journal of Australian Studies* 39(4): 477–493. DOI: 10.1080/14443058.2015.1080176.
- Klas A, Zinkiewicz L, Zhou J, et al. (2018) 'Not All Environmentalists Are Like That ...': Unpacking the Negative and Positive Beliefs and Perceptions of Environmentalists. *Environmental Communication* 0(0): 1–15. DOI: 10.1080/17524032.2018.1488755.
- [Lester, L \(2007\) *Giving Ground: Media and Environmental Conflict in Tasmania, Hobart: Quintus.*](#)
- Lester L (2011) Species of the Month: Anti-Whaling, Mediated Visibility, and the News. *Environmental Communication* 5(1): 124–139. DOI: 10.1080/17524032.2010.542768.
- McGaurr L (2015) *Environmental Communication and Travel Journalism: Consumerism, Conflict and Concern*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- [McGaurr, L, and Lester, L \(2017\) *Environmental Groups Treading the Discursive*](#)

[Tightrope of Social Licence. *International Journal of Communication* 11: 3476–3496.](#)

Formatted: Font: Italic

[McGregor A \(2004\) Sustainable Development and 'Warm Fuzzy Feelings': Discourse and Nature within Australian Environmental Imaginaries. *Geoforum* 35\(4\): 593–606.](#)

McHendry GF (2012) Whale Wars and the Axiomatization of Image Events on the Public Screen. *Environmental Communication* 6(2): 139–155. DOI: 10.1080/17524032.2012.662163.

McKie R (2017) How Sea Shepherd lost battle against Japan's whale hunters in Antarctic. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2017/dec/23/sea-shepherd-loses-antarctic-battle-japan-whale-hunters> (accessed 20 January 2018).

Milstein T (2011) Nature identification: The power of pointing and naming. *Environmental Communication: A Journal of Culture and Nature* 5(1): 3–24.

Moffa ALI (2012) Two competing models of activism, one goal: A case study of anti-whaling campaigns in the South Ocean. *Yale Journal of International Law* 37(1): 201–214.

Nagtzaam G (2014) Gaia's Navy: The Sea Shepherd Conservation Society's Battle to Stay Afloat and International Law. *William & Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review* 38(3): 613–694.

Nagtzaam G (2017) *From Environmental Action to Ecoterrorism? Towards a Process Theory of Environmental and Animal Rights Oriented Political Violence*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Nagtzaam G and Lentini P (2007) Vigilantes on the High Seas?: The Sea Shepherds and Political Violence. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 20(1): 110–133. DOI: 10.1080/09546550701723658.

Plumwood V (1997) Androcentrism and Anthropocentrism: Parallels and Politics. In: Warren KJ (ed.) *Ecofeminism: Women, Culture, Nature*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Russill C (2009) Whale Wars: A Deeper Shade of Green on the Public Screen. In: *Flow*. Available at: <https://www.flowjournal.org/2009/04/whale-wars-a-deeper-shade-of-green-on-the-public-screen%20-%a0-chris-russill%20-%a0%20university-of-minnesota%20-%a0/> (accessed 20 January 2018).

Sea Shepherd Global (2018) Our Mission. Available at: <https://www.seashepherdglobal.org/who-we-are/our-mission/> (accessed 20 January 2018).

- Sea Shepherd Global (2019) Get Involved. Available at:
<https://www.seashepherdglobal.org/get-involved/donate/>.
- Singleton B E (2016) Love-iathan, the Meat-whale and Hidden People: Ordering Faroese Pilot Whaling. *Journal of Political Ecology* 23: 26–48.
- [Singleton B E \(2019\) The evolution of the super-whale. Complexity and simplicity in environmental communication. *Marine Policy* 99: 170–172.](#)
- Sønderskov KM (2008) Environmental group membership, collective action and generalised trust. *Environmental Politics* 17(1): 78–94. DOI: 10.1080/09644010701811673.
- Stuart A, Thomas EF, Donaghue N, et al. (2013) ‘We may be pirates, but we are not protesters’: Identity in the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society. *Political Psychology* 34(5): 753–777. DOI: 10.1111/pops.12016.
- Tipa G (2009) Exploring Indigenous Understandings of River Dynamics and River Flows: A Case from New Zealand. *Environmental Communication* 3(1): 95–120.
- [van Ginkel R \(2004\) The Makah Whale Hunt and Leviathan’s Death: Reinventing Tradition and Disputing Authenticity in the Age of Modernity. *Etnofoor* 17\(1/2\): 58–89.](#)
- [Watson P \(1993\) *Earthforce!: An Earth Warrior’s Guide to Strategy*. Los Angeles: Chaco Press](#)
- Watson P (1994) *Ocean Warrior : My Battle to End the Illegal Slaughter On the High Seas*. Toronto: Key Porter Books.
- Watson P (2003) *Seal Wars: Twenty-Five Years on the Front Lines with the Harp Seals*. Buffalo, NY: Firefly Books.
- [Watson, P. \(2017a, 14 November\). Sea Shepherd and Japanese whaling: A message from Captain Paul Watson. *Sea Shepherd Global*. Available at: <https://www.seashepherdglobal.org/latest-news/sea-shepherd-japanese-whaling/> \(Accessed 14 January 2018\)](#)
- [Watson P \(2017\) Sea Shepherd and Japanese whaling: A message from Captain Paul Watson. *Sea Shepherd Global*, 14 November. Available at: <https://www.seashepherdglobal.org/latest-news/sea-shepherd-japanese-whaling/> \(accessed 14 January 2018\).](#) [Watson, P. \(2017b, 1 September\). Sea Shepherd must adapt to more effectively defend Dolphins. Available at: <https://seashepherd.org/2017/09/01/sea-shepherd-must-adapt-to-more-effectively-defend-dolphins/> \(Accessed 30 October 2018\)](#)

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

|

Yoder K (2018) War of words. *Grist*, 5 December. Available at:
<https://grist.org/article/the-war-on-climate-the-climate-fight-are-we-approaching-the-problem-all-wrong/> (accessed 14 August 2019).

Final Draft